

Stakeholder Meeting, Comment and Discussion Log

External Party	Date	Key Issues discussed	Resources shared during (or as a result of) the meeting
OAIC	09/14/2023	<p>Privacy Act review and potential change to remove small business exemption 'reasonable test' for collecting information. The OAIC noted that it must be clear why information is required, and deletion of data when no longer needed is important.</p>	<p>The following OAIC resource may be helpful for telcos seeking assistance in developing a data breach response plan: Data breach preparation and response (July 2019). This includes a data breach response plan checklist at p. 17.</p> <p>Other relevant resources include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preventing data breaches: advice from the Australian Cyber Security Centre • The OAIC's own data breach response plan (November 2021)
First Nations Digital Inclusion Advisory Group (FNDIAG)	09/20/2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FNDIAG report & roadmap • Culture awareness/language needs (ref. e-safety; TIO resources) • Authentication issues (problems with ID) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIO Languages e.g.s - https://www.tio.com.au/brochures-and-flyers • E-safety language e.g.s - https://www.esafety.gov.au/first-nations
ACMA	09/21/2023	<p>Process. Noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACMA staff cannot speak for the Authority, which might have different views from staff. Individual Authority members may also have divergent views. It may be possible for CA to test some ideas directly with an individual Authority member before 15 December. • ACMA does not expect full Code by Dec but 'definitive and agreed views' with 'sample drafting' on key areas. (Notwithstanding that this process will not have allowed for formal consultation by this point.). Timelines after 15 Dec are unclear (no Authority meeting after 15 Dec until 2024. ACMA expect that, if the Authority considers the 'best effort' sample Code not good enough, there would be discussions with the Minister, Dept and then steps like for FH Direction. <p>NOTES: (1) Discussion suggested that, if required, it may also be possible for CA to receive feedback on its 'best efforts' proposal</p>	<p>Shared by CA prior – payment and small business issues papers.</p>

	<p>directly from the Authority and provided an opportunity to resubmit, rather than moving directly to directly regulate. (2) CA is responsible for making it clear in papers submitted by Dec 15 any relevant background and considerations for its proposed positions.</p> <p>Payment methods. ACMA welcomed suggested proposed flexibility requirements around DD payments but made it clear that their view (based on consumer research and other inputs) was that more than one free payment method is required (e.g., something like BPay plus DD) and that this outweighed any likely unintended consequences.</p> <p>Small business definition. Want alignment with existing definitions - e.g., ACL - but recognise that ACL is economy-wide, and this is a telco-specific instrument, so the kind of carve-outs that the DC is proposing (to ensure that the protection offered is for small business) seems reasonable. Noted that the FH Standard would be aligned with the ACL.</p>	
--	---	--